The Times-Dispatch

Published every day in the year by The Times-Dispatch Publishing Co., Inc.
THE TIMES, Founded.....1888
THE DISPATCH, Founded.....1850
Address all communications
THE TIMES-DISPATCH.
Telephone, Randolph 1.
Publication Office.....10 South Tenth Street
South Richmond.....1026 Hull Street
Petersburg.....109 North Sycamore Street
Lynchburg.....218 Eighth Street

HASBROOK, STORY & BROOKS, INC.,
Special Advertising Representatives.
New York.....200 Fifth Avenue
Philadelphia.....Mutual Life Building
Chicago.....People's Gas Building

SUBSCRIPTION RATES.

BY MAIL. POSTAGE PAID.	One Year.	Six Mos.	Three Mos.	One Mo.
Daily and Sunday	$6.00	$3.00	$1.50	$ .55
Daily only	4.00	2.00	1.00	.35
Sunday only	2.00	1.00	.50	.25

By Times-Dispatch Carrier Delivery Service in Richmond (and suburbs) and Petersburg:
Daily with Sunday, one week.....15 cents
Daily without Sunday, one week.....10 cents
Sunday only.....5 cents

Entered January 27, 1905, at Richmond, Va., as second-class matter under act of Congress of March 3, 1879.

SUNDAY, NOVEMBER 1, 1914.

Texas

GOVERNOR COLQUITT—the same Texas executive who thought Mexico would overrun the border unless the Rangers started something—is now violently agitated lest Texas go completely broke. In a message to the Legislature he sees no relief save through a moratorium. Things are very much on the verge, says Governor Colquitt.

Folk outside of Texas, who have been taught to look upon that State as the home of forehanded and forthright men, big steers and resources, are not going to share Governor Colquitt's alarm, either about Mexico or about money. If a moratorium be necessary, that won't hurt Texas. The individual Texan is as big as his State, and a financial shift for expediency won't frighten any one.

This is no time to be alarmed. There are real conditions to be faced, real extremes to be met, but starting a scare is no way to meet them. And that applies to the whole country as well as to Texas.

Let's Make Virginia Unanimous

THE well-founded hope that the Ninth Virginia District will be redeemed from republicanism and that the State will return a solid Democratic delegation next Tuesday, shines with especial radiance.

Democratic candidates in the other districts are assured of election. The danger is that this confidence will be reflected in the attitude of the voting population, many of whom will stay away from the polls because they think it unnecessary to aid a fight already won. That attitude involves a capital error of judgment. This is a Democratic Commonwealth, the native State of the President, and its Democratic Representatives in Congress, by virtue of long service and recognized abilities, fill conspicuous positions in the counsels of the party. Some are chairmen of important House committees, like Mr. Glass, of Banking and Currency, and Mr. Flood, of Foreign Affairs, for example, that place them in intimate relation to the conduct of Democratic policies. Without exception, they have been loyal supporters of the great program of legislation that the President initiated and Congress enacted. It is incumbent on their constituents to return all of them to office by handsomely enlarged majorities.

Local Option in Education

WHEN the Richmond voter goes to the polls day after to-morrow and casts his vote for the re-election to Congress of Andrew J. Montague, he will have opportunity also to vote for a measure Mr. Montague influenced when he was Governor. That measure is the compulsory education law, which is to be the subject of a referendum.

It was through Governor Montague, in large part, that the compulsory education law acquired its local option feature. He believed that on this important subject each community should have the right to register its preference—to decide whether the law should become operative.

There ought to be no question of what should be done here in Richmond. The standard of future citizenship, the obligation the city owes to childhood's expanding intelligence, the immediate duty to lessen, so far as possible, the burden of child labor, are all involved.

There are persons who object to compulsory education because it is "compulsory." They would be quite as logical if they objected to paying taxes, or refraining from crimes, because the law is mandatory on these subjects. There is nothing novel in a provision of law that requires men to do under penalty what they should do without urging or insistence—the novelty is only in the application of the principle to a department of life to which it should have been introduced long ago.

Lessons of Cotton Fund Meeting

THERE is more than one lesson to be learned from the meeting of Richmond business men at the Chamber of Commerce yesterday, when $558,500 was subscribed to the national cotton loan fund, which will amount in its entirety to $135,000,000. One is that Richmond stands ready to assist every sound and well-considered plan to relieve business congestion in the cotton States, but the meeting showed also that Richmond thrives and prospers despite stagnation elsewhere, and is quite able to respond promptly when the need arises.

Everywhere almost there is evidence of a reviving prosperity. Exports are increasing, bank clearances are improving, wholesale and retail trade shows decided betterment, the copper trade is gaining a new interest in life, and steel looks to the railroads to put it back on the way to wealth. The $135,000,000 cotton fund will take care of 5,000,000 bales, which represents the excess of this year's crop over the depleted demand. The rest of the crop ought to sell for fair prices, for the mills, which have been withholding their orders, will buy as soon as they feel reasonable certainty that prices are not going to drop.

The United States is not yet out of the mire, of course, but it is climbing every day. It will be months, perhaps years, before we stop paying the toll the European war exacts, but, at the same time, we shall be collecting some incidental benefits. This is no time for the pessimist, in city, State or nation. Good times, or at any rate far better times, are on their way.

In Sorrow's Borrowed Plumage

THERE is so much suffering, so much want, so much misery in the world just now, that its alleviation, or the hope of alleviating it, batters unceasingly at the door of every kindly and generous heart. It is not possible to resist appeals backed by descriptions of battle scenes in Europe, of men wounded and dying without care or attention, of lives, that might have been saved by prompt and skilled treatment, sacrificed to the inexorable necessities of the god of war.

Belgium has been made a waste and a shambles. The flower of its manhood have laid down their lives for their country, and in the ruined, flame-blackened villages women and children mourn unceasingly. Holland and England are overrun with Belgian refugees. Starvation impends. In lesser degree the same thing is true of those portions of France over which the flood of war has swept. In still lesser degree it is true of other belligerent nations.

But this imperative need and the universal pity it has excited possess their dangers also. In New York a woman who pretended to have the backing of the Prince of Wales relief fund for a charity bazaar and ball she was organizing has been shown to be an impostor, and has made an inconspicuous disappearance, but not before she had mulcted hotels and business houses of considerable sums of money. Other cities have had similar experiences.

It is hard to demand credentials from those who ask help for war's victims, but unless the person who makes the appeal is known personally, that is the wise and proper thing to do. We shall have suffering of our own here in Richmond this winter—suffering that the charitable and the generous in spirit will have to alleviate. This consideration, perhaps, should not decrease gifts designed to be sent abroad, but it certainly demands the careful avoidance of all waste.

The Higher Call

IT is refreshing, after thinking it over a few days, to recall the fact that Hugo Munsterberg resigned the chair of psychology in Harvard when Major Clarence Wiener threatened to withdraw a legacy of $10,000,000 from that institution if it retained that pro-Germanite in the faculty. It was proof enough of Munsterberg's bigness, that he was ready to quit any institution that was small enough to rank the dollar above the brains.

It is very refreshing—most astonishingly refreshing—to recall that Harvard sent Munsterberg's resignation back with an unhesitating preference for brains. And it is again refreshing to know that Munsterberg will remain, with the privilege of holding his own opinions, and, if occasion arise, expressing them, without reference to any one's bank account or last will and testament.

Just for a moment—for a fleeting moment—some folk thought Harvard might yearn for that $10,000,000 so strongly as to produce complications. If one of America's greatest educational institutions had stooped to such low ambition, its influence in its proper sphere would have been seriously crippled. And when an educational institution is taken out of its class, when the higher call is put on the end of strings like a puppet, to be made to dance and do foolish things at the pulling of mere money, it will be a fine day for soap and pork and other commodities, but a bad day for the national hope.

The Morbid Youth

A FEW days ago, in Freeland, Mich., two boys of ten and twelve years shot themselves in the head with small pistols and died. They couldn't live any longer, because, having played truant from school, they feared punishment. Life had become a terror and a burden to them. Before they had grown out of knickerbockers they had decided that it was impossible to live. They had talked it all over and entered a suicide pact.

What sort of an age is this in which we live? When babies confer on matters of life and death, it is about time for some one to begin an investigation. It has been only a short time since a boy of twelve held up, killed and robbed the body of a man in Baltimore. When arrested, he seemed surprised that nobody could understand that his act was a natural one. He had seen it done precisely that way in a moving picture, move for move. He had not departed from his text.

These are not isolated cases. Almost any day the news columns bear similar tidings of an era of youthful crime, degeneracy and morbidity. Of course, there is neglect at home, lack of healthy supervision and direction; there are parental crimes that are behind the doors of home. But there is something else, and the most popular idea is to blame it on the moving pictures. If this is true, what rigidity should there be in moving-picture censorship?

When babies meditate upon crime and suicide, it is time to shudder.

Was the Steel Trust Afraid?

ONLY recently the celebrated "Gary dinners," at which Judge E. H. Gary, chairman of the board of the United States Steel Corporation, was the host and heads of various other steel companies the guests, have been the subject of renewed and animated discussion. The arguments have been made in Philadelphia, at the hearing of the government's suit to dissolve the corporation.

Counsel for the defendant described these dinners as exceedingly beneficent and philanthropic affairs, while the government's counsel, Jacob M. Dickinson, said they were for the purpose of fixing prices, dividing territory and limiting output. The only reason the Steel Corporation has not crushed its smaller competitors, according to Mr. Dickinson, is that it has had too much sense, well understanding that the disappearance of even the semblance of competition would be followed by a crushing attack from the Department of Justice on its own unwieldy bulk.

At the worst, this shows the big trust in a new and unusual light. It is not accustomed to pay to the law of the land that scant and unwilling and ungracious homage that is the product of fear.

It is almost a pity that Congressman Montague has not more substantial opposition. He is so sure of victory it will be hard to get folks to the polls.

SONGS AND SAWS

He Did Not.

"Do you believe in love eternal?"
The sentimental maiden sighed.
"Not that especial pain infernal,"
The crabbed bachelor replied.
"Satan, I'm told, possesses rare good breeding,
And so, in some secluded part of Hades,
He will, in answer to the bachelors' pleading,
Establish separate quarters for the ladies."

The Pessimist Says:

If you have to decide between being run down by an automobile or a street car, pick the auto. It is more classy, in the first place, and you may get a free ride to the hospital.

They Had Heard Him.

Stubbs—Is Brown asked to sing as often as he was last winter?

Grubbs—Not quite. You see, his voice has become somewhat better known.

He Got His Share.

She—Didn't you simply adore the one-step?

He—Not so you'd notice it especially. I do that dance all the way to the office every morning, and it is no treat to me to repeat the performance all night.

Understood at Last.

"I have just found out what the Kaiser must have meant when he said he stood out for peace," declared the Prominent Citizen. "He meant that he would not box the ears of the other nations if they did exactly what he told them to do."

Another of War's Horrors.

Miss Passe—War is an awful thing, isn't it?

Miss Antique—It certainly is. Statistics say that after this war is over there may be twice as many women as there are men.

United at Last.

'Twill be a mighty pleasant thing
When we all can rise and sing:
"See Virginia's Congressmen!
Ten good Democrats—count 'em—ten!
Tate Irvine's won his victory—
The Ninth is back where it should be!"

THE TATTLER.

Chats With Virginia Editors

The Newport News Times-Herald says: "Villa may be named Arango, but Carranza's name is mud." An old gentleman we met on the Gulf of Mexico, who employed the ex-bandit as a guide through the mountains of Mexico many years ago, and who is familiar with the yclept "liberator's" genealogy, informed us that his name originally was Pancho Villa. But we don't care what they call Villa or Carranza.

"The fate of Leo Frank, convicted of the murder of a young girl in Atlanta nearly two years ago, is still in the balance," the Danville Bee brings to your kind attention. An accountant would say, in the trial balance.

For the information of whomsoever may be seeking it, it is our painful duty to say that the exhibit in evidence proves beyond the peradventure of a doubt that the jewel of consistency is not in the possession of Editor Warren, of the Chatham Enterprise. The Enterprise carries a column editorial advertising the burlesque show whose manager was fined in Richmond for giving an indecent performance, the editorial purporting to be a scolding of the Richmond newspapers for giving publicity to that theatrical attraction.

Editor Johnston, of the Williamsburg Gazette, herewith serves notice: "Poke fun at our ancient customs; say that we sleep while the rest of the world moves on; preach of decadence till the crack of doom; tell the old, old story that Williamsburg is a finished town; sing of us as the lotus land and wreath fantastic stories of what it has been, but you cannot rob us of past glory or present greatness. What other town on earth can feed its population on mushrooms from its public gardens with the only cost the effort to gather the edibles?" From which we gather that Williamsburg is gradually approaching the plight of the Pamunkey and Chickahominy Indians, who were described by a redskin from the reservation recently as facing a hard winter with nothing to eat except sora, quail, canvasback duck and mushrooms. The potato and bean crops had failed.

Says the Farmville Herald: "Mr Taft extols the real comfort of a quiet, modest, silent life. And the people are well pleased at the change, too, Mr. Taft; so we'll all shake!" Mr. Taft would probably decline to extol the judgment of the man who went out to hunt foxes, taking a brass band along with him.

Current Editorial Comment

Cleaning House in New Haven

It must be a matter of pride for President Howard Elliott to be able to announce that the changes yesterday in the New Haven directorate "leave no man on the board who participated in the transactions which have been the subject of discussion." He means that the backers of Mellen are all out. The five new men are all New Englanders, and housecleaning is complete. The legitimate earning capacity of this system, divorced from steamships and trolleys and monopolistic control of the Boston and Maine, is tremendous. It should have a good future. The work of overcoming the handicaps imposed by past mismanagement, and of repairing losses incurred by excursions into the monopoly field, will be slow, of course. It is easy to descend into some places and hard to get back. But Americans generally hope the best from the Elliott management of the New Haven. What has been a tragedy to banks and small investors in New England can never be forgotten. In time it will be forgiven, if the ideals of public service, in which Mr. Elliott indulges, can be made to materialize.—Brooklyn Eagle.

British People and Prince Louis

The British are a brave people, but occasionally they are subject to attacks of "nerves." They must be suffering from one of these attacks now, to judge from their treatment of Prince Louis of Battenberg, who has resigned his position as one of the Lords of Admiralty. A London newspaper has led a campaign of innuendo against him, arguing that this is no time to put officers of German extraction on guard. The career of the prince pleads to no effect in mitigation of popular prejudice. He is a naturalized British subject, has passed forty-six of his sixty years in the British navy, and is more than merely a competent officer. Winston Churchill gives him a written certificate of zeal and loyalty during the present war. King George summons him to the Privy Council; nevertheless he must go because his parents were Germans and he was born in Austria. This is the hardest kind of hard treatment for a veteran officer nearing old age, for suspicion will haunt his steps through the remainder of his life. Where one man will give him full credit for loyalty, ten will shrug their shoulders. If Great Britain is to draw a line against German extraction, will it go higher up?—Boston Transcript.

Self-Denial Not the Same as Charity

To confuse self-denial with charity is easy, but it would be wrong to charge it upon the Vassar Students' Association, which has resolved that the students curtail expenses this year, and has appointed a committee with faculty representation to consider the best use of the money saved. Had such action been taken without regard to caterers, florists, seamstresses and other workers, partly dependent upon the student, it would have been open to objection. But the Vassar mass-meeting was addressed by a professor who had made a survey of Poughkeepsie trade conditions, and who gave assurance that retrenchment in certain directions would work no local distress. Yet he warned the students that, in general, "the worst thing one could do at such a time was to draw money from banks and to cease spending." Probably most Vassar students are upon a fixed allowance; they are eager to make the best possible use of the money above their margin of necessary expense. If by doing without some wonted luxury they can directly divert a certain sum from a prosperous tradesman's pocket to the poor of this country or Europe, they are entitled to a proper moral glow. No one should thoughtlessly stop his expenditures in order to increase his gifts; thoughtfully to increase the balance of the one against the other is the way to make charity grow as this year it should.—New York Evening Post.

The Voice of the People

Word Doctors Wanted.

To the Editor of The Times-Dispatch:

Sir,—How did you find out it is "Shimeazel"? Did you ask the Russian ambassador? Shimeazel! (Good thing to be shy of!) I can understand how you might get measle out of mysl—though that is not the way one usually gets it—but how any self-respecting etymologist can get "shi" out of prze is beyond my ken. Looks more like getting a prize, and that is what he deserves. Better send some word doctors over with the Red Cross contingent!

However, thank you for the pronunciation. Like to have a complete vocabulary till the war is over. Hoping that may be soon, I am,

ZELLE MINOR.

Richmond, October 26, 1914.

Woman's "Right" to Vote.

To the Editor of The Times-Dispatch:

Sir,—I read in a recent issue of your paper a letter from an antisuffragist, in which she laments the supposed tendency of suffragists to "array the sexes against each other, and change those designed by nature as complements into competitors and rivals."

Is it really true that the suffragists have such sinister designs on nature? And does "Virginia Woman" believe that the stupidity and intellectual imbecility of the American people is so omnipresent and insistent that they will quietly condone the establishment by a band of suffragists of such a pernicious and unnatural principle as woman suffrage in every State of the Union? This is just what she deplores, and yet actually expects, for she ends with an appeal to the sons of Virginia, of whom I am one, to see to it that she shall have the honor of being the very last State in which "the sincerest admiration for women" shall be blotted out by female suffrage. And on the very same page I note the headline, "More Than 60,000 Women Discharged," and underneath read the cause of the misfortune which has made these innocent victims the direct economic result of man-made war, thus illustrating beautifully the "self-immolation and heroism" of men "who build ships and houses and go to war for (?) women." Perhaps these women might make some use of their right to the ballot, although "Virginia Woman" would not.

"The truth is," she says, "we are partners in a world of sorrow and difficulty—brought into it, it is pertinent to mention, by woman's first rebellion against Divine limitations"—and kept in it, she might add, by her ignorance and continual nonresistance to illusory restrictions—"from which men are not more exempt than ourselves, and from which (generally speaking)" they make no intelligent effort to be.

The constitutional and psychological differences between men and women do not imply an inequality between them on the plane of human life and activity, but before nature's law they stand as companions and equals. "Man's leading trait is his aggressiveness; that of woman, self-surrender." Women are human beings, and governments exist among human beings only with the consent of the governed. It, therefore, logically follows that women should have a voice in the making of the laws under which they live, and which they are forced to obey, though none would be forced to exercise their political power. C. CALLAWAY.

Norwood, Va., October 28, 1914.

The Bright Side of Life

Very Good Reason.

Parson—How is it I haven't seen you at church lately?

Hodge—I ain't been.—Printer's Pie.

He Never Does.

"Did your barber shut up Sunday?"

"No. He merely closed his shop."—Indianapolis Journal.

Enough!

"Don't keep pestering me."

"Then you won't marry me?"

"I wouldn't even be engaged to you at a summer resort."—Louisville Courier-Journal.

A Mere Dabbler.

"Professor Mynde is a leader among the psychologists, don't you think?"

"I think nothing of the sort. On page 137 of his latest book the word 'function' occurs only four times, and on page 301 he uses the word 'reaction' only twice."—Life.

Befogged.

A London merchant received a telephone message one morning from one of his clerks. "I am sorry, Mr. Wilson," said the clerk, over the wire, "I cannot come down to the shop this morning on account of the fog; but the fact is that I have not yet arrived home yesterday."—Exchange.

A Clever Precaution.

Mike—Begorra, an' I had to go through the woods the other night where Casey was murthered last year, an' that they say is haunted, an', bedad, I walked backward the whole way.

Pat—An' what for wuz ye after doin' that?

Mike—Faith, man, so that I could see if anythin' wuz comin' up behind me.—Tit-Bits.

Queries and Answers

Carter Braxton.

Can you tell me where Carter Braxton, the signer, was buried? Mc

No one seems to know. He died in Richmond, as stated in your note; and it appears to be the general impression that the interment was at his ancestral estate, Newington, but the grave may, it appears, not now be located.

King in Gloucester.

What King was born in Gloucester? Was that region the location of the Pocahontas rescue of Smith? C. M. M.

There is neither record nor legend, so far as we know, of the birth of any King in Gloucester County, Virginia. Powhatan was "crowned" there by Newport, and Pocahontas and one of her brothers were, it is tolerably certain, born there. The rescue incident took place in Gloucester, at Rosegill, as some suppose, where on the lawn two large stones mark the place of the transaction. Others consider Shelly, adjoining Rosegill, to be the spot where Smith was rescued.

The Days That Lie Behind Us.

[For The Times-Dispatch.]

'Tis not for Hope, the starry-eyed,
To think of days behind us;
'Tis not for Joy to stem the tide,
And of the Past remind us;
But Memory loves to think of them,
Those bygone hours to cherish;
She wears them all, a diadem
Whose beauty ne'er shall perish!

And often when the twilight hour
O'er hill and valley's falling,
A voice of sweetness and of power
Seems to our spirits calling;
Then Fancy comes from realms of bliss,
With wondrous charm to bind us,
And Memory turns and wafts a kiss
To days that lie behind us!

"To-day" may be the watchword still—
The call to strong endeavor—
To-morrow from the future's hill
May beckon to us ever;
But far away down memory's stream
The twilight hour shall find us;
There would we drift awhile and dream
Of days that lie behind us!

T. RUSSELL SHELTON.

ISN'T THAT JUST LIKE A KID?

One of the Day's Best Cartoons.

—From the Boston Globe.

NEED TREATIES BE CONSTITUTIONAL?

BY HENRY THOMPSON LOUTHAN, M. A.

As so many of the world powers have recently been drawn into war on account of their alliances it is a propitious time to consider to what extent the citizens of America may be bound by treaties made under the authority of the United States.

Professor John H. Latane, of Johns Hopkins University, declared not long since that our treaties do not have to be made "in pursuance of the Constitution." He cited the following part of section 2, article 6, of the Constitution, which says:

"This Constitution and the laws of the United States, which shall be made in pursuance thereof, and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land."

From this Dr. Latane argued that our Federal laws must not be in violation of the United States Constitution, but that treaties need only to be made "under the authority of the United States." In other words, his contention was that if the President and two-thirds of the Senators agree upon a treaty, it shall be a part of the supreme law of the land, notwithstanding the fact that it may contravene some of the fundamental rights insured by the Constitution to our citizens.

This is a new and interesting question. But has the correct interpretation been given to this clause relating to treaties? Let us see:

Dr. Latane called attention to the fact that treaties had been known to nullify State laws in more than one case. He might have mentioned, for example, the case of a Russian, who died a few years ago in Cambridge, Mass., and, according to the law of that Commonwealth, the local officer undertook to settle the estate. The Russian consul for that district showed, however, that by a treaty between Russia and the United States, he had the right to administer the estate of his deceased countryman there, and his claim was upheld.

But this does not strengthen his contention that treaties may be unconstitutional, and still be a part of the supreme law of the land. He failed to call attention to the latter part of the section of the Constitution, referred to above, which says in regard to Federal laws, the Constitution and treaties, that "the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or law of any State to the contrary notwithstanding."

Treaties, according to this clause, may nullify State laws and even State Constitutions, and still be in pursuance of the Constitution. But when can such treaties be made? Evidently only when State laws or State Constitutions assume powers not guaranteed to the States by the Constitution of the United States.

The above quotation says that "the judges in every State shall be bound" by Federal laws. But we well know that our judges are not bound by all laws passed by Congress and signed by the President, for some of them are unconstitutional. The fathers of '87 saw that a single State might force our whole country into war, and therefore inserted this clause for the general guidance of "the judges." They perceived further, however, that the President and Senate, by means of treaties, might violate rights that belong to the States alone, and consequently they "wrote large" that the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people. The Constitution must be interpreted as a whole and not by isolated sections.

Why then should we infer that treaties, like a great war lord, may ignore the Constitution? Treaties "made under the authority of the United States" means made under the powers given by the Constitution to the President and Senators; and these citizens when they take office are sworn to preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States. They would certainly violate their oath, if they made a treaty which was not in pursuance of the Constitution.

The fact that the Supreme Court of the United States has never declared a treaty unconstitutional does not mean that it may not do so if the necessity should arise. This court once said that whenever an act of Congress would be unconstitutional as invading the reserved rights of the States, a treaty to the same effect would be unconstitutional. (Prevost v. Greneaux, 19 Howard, 7).

Despite the fact that some of our treaties have been very unpopular, it is to the honor of our Presidents and Senators that we have yet to see a treaty, if we except the treaties made with so-called Indian nations, that has contravened the fundamental rights of American citizens.

One exception was the treaty made by the United States with the Cherokee Nation, residing within the geographical limits of the State of Georgia. The noted case of "Worcester against the State of Georgia" arose under this treaty. Georgia had made a law, subjecting to punishment all white persons residing within the limits of the Cherokee Nation who had not obtained a license from the State to reside there, and had not taken an oath of allegiance to the State. But the United States, in its treaty, had recognized the Cherokees as a distinct and separate political community, authorized to govern within its own territory, wholly exempt from the control of Georgia.

Worcester, a native of Vermont, was sent, under permission of President John Quincy Adams, as a missionary to the Cherokee Nation. He obtained no license from the State. The State of Georgia caused Worcester's arrest within the limits of the Cherokee Nation, and he was tried in the State court for a violation of the State law, and was sentenced to the penitentiary for four years. The case was brought before the Supreme Court of the United States, which held that the treaty was the supreme law, and reversed the conviction. It was 1833 by this time, and Andrew Jackson was President. He evidently considered the treaty unconstitutional, for he said: "John Marshall has made his decision, now let him execute it." Worcester remained in prison until the Governor of Georgia, conceiving that he had won the victory, pardoned him.

Had President Roosevelt made a new treaty with Japan, after finding that the citizens of California and of the Sunrise Kingdom could not agree upon "the school question," and in this treaty had said that the Japanese in America could enter any of our public schools as pupils, this treaty would have been unconstitutional, for each State has exclusive jurisdiction over her public school system.

Another thing to the honor of our treaty-makers is that they have not stood for secret diplomacy—a special form of unconstitutional treaties. The diplomatic policy long followed by Europe was denounced in a most vigorous manner in a recent editorial by the London Daily News in a discussion of the great war. It pertinently asks whether the people of that continent can ever again tolerate the appalling peril of secret diplomacy. Whether they can ever again play about on the deck with the sails and compass, making their little laws and imagining that they are self-governing, while down in the hold of their ship of state there is a powder magazine, the very existence of which they are not permitted to know. It well says that secret diplomacy belongs to the traditions of autocratic and personal government; that it has no place in a democratic world, and that the example of the United States must become the model of the civilized world on this vital matter if Europe is to be free from menace in the future.

Let our treaties continue to be made "in pursuance of the Constitution," continue to be an open book to the world, and it will be many a long year before we shall be responsible for a war brought upon us because we have made foolish alliances.

Lorne, Va.

Alleged Dangers to Eye

The eye is of such supreme importance to man, and its mechanism is so delicate, that it is quite naturally regarded as peculiarly susceptible to all sorts of offending agencies and exposed to a myriad of unsuspected dangers. Many of these fears and beliefs are well grounded. Some of them, on the other hand, have led to unwarrantable conclusions. Certain of the modern illuminants have acquired the reputation of being dangerous by reason of injurious effects of the ultraviolet radiation delivered by them.

Drs. Verhoeff and Bell, of Boston, have published a summary of an investigation of the effects of radiation on the eye. The vital question is not whether a light source gives ultraviolet radiations, but whether it gives them of such kind, and in sufficient quantity as to injure the eye. They find that no artificial source of light used for illuminating purposes contains enough ultraviolet radiation to involve the slightest danger to the eye.

Experiments on rabbits, monkeys, etc., and observations on the human subject prove that the retina may be flooded for an hour or more with light of extreme intensity, without any sign of permanent injury. Only when the concentration of light involves enough heat is the retina liable to be injured. Actual experiments made on the human eye show conclusively that no concentration of radiation on the retina from any artificial illuminant is sufficient to produce injury under any practical conditions. Glass-blowers's cataract, often charged to specific radiation, ultraviolet or other, is regarded as probably due to the overheating of the eye as a whole, with consequent disturbed nutrition of the lens.